

ATTACHMENT 5 – Review Panel Evaluation of Lead Entity Strategies and Lists

Lead Entity: **Chelan County**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan
1. Actions and geographic areas The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
Rating: ___ Excellent ¹ <u>X</u> Good ___ Fair ___ Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Not all projects are in the highest priority areas (assessment units).</i> <i>The strategy summary was not helpful.</i>
2. Fit of project ranking The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests?
Rating: ___ Excellent ² <u>X</u> Good <u>X</u> Fair ___ Poor

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The ranking criteria and method are unclear.

It is not clear why there are no projects in category 1 watersheds.

The Leavenworth fish screen project (#1) is not called for in the strategy.

There are projects on the list that do not appear to be ranked as would be expected (e.g., Gagnon CMZ, is higher).

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The basis for the project list is the strategy, which is part of the 6/30/05 draft of the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Plan.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor County**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
1. <i>Species and stocks</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Depressed stocks are identified as the highest priorities.</i> <i>Species profiles could be very useful to prioritize stocks at a greater level of specificity.</i>
2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>General (watershed scale) processes are identified but should be more locally specific and prioritized.</i> <i>Limiting factors analysis is basis for processes priorities.</i> <i>Processes are generally identified by watershed but not well prioritized, and a clear rationale for those processes is not provided.</i>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X Good** _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features based on limiting factors analysis are identified as important but they are not prioritized as to their relationships to priority stocks.

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁵ **X Good** **X Fair** _____Poor

Watersheds are prioritized and priority actions are identified at that scale but there is a lack of direction about where the actions could be best applied within watersheds.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: Excellent⁶ Good **X** Fair Poor

In this years' strategy, the community outreach and strategy to address the highest priority biological needs is not focused or specific.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: Excellent⁷ Good **X** Fair Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Although based on limiting factors analysis, it is not clear how other available information affected prioritization of processes, features, actions and areas.

The strategy and prioritization did not appear to be well supported by clearly laid out hypotheses and assumptions, and much of the information does not appear to be empirical.

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan
<p>7. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: <u> </u> Excellent⁸ <u> </u> Good <u>X</u> Fair <u> </u> Poor</p>
<p><i>Almost half of the projects do not address highest priority areas or stocks.</i></p>
<p>8. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests?
<p>Rating: <u> </u> Excellent⁹ <u>X</u> Good <u> </u> Fair <u> </u> Poor</p>
<p><i>The order of the projects is reasonably consistent with the priorities in the strategy, but the priorities in the strategy are very broad.</i></p>

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰
The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?• Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?• Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?•
Narrative only: <i>Not applicable. No regional recovery planning organization operates in this lead entity area.</i>

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Hood Canal Coordinating Council**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹				
1. Species and stocks				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? Is the status of each stock presented? Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities? 				
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
2. Watershed and marine ecological processes				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities? 				
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<p><i>In general, the strategy summary is of limited utility because it fails to summarize salient points, and simply refers readers to a large amount of documentation.</i></p> <p><i>The summary has a good discussion of nearshore process issues and how those translate into projects (the same is needed for the highest priority subbasins).</i></p> <p><i>Subbasin descriptions could better summarize the rationale for identified process priorities and linkages to projects (e.g., include separate headings for features and processes).</i></p>				

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____ Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Prioritization and rationale needs improvement, including clarifying the relationships to fish (e.g., life stages).

Subbasin descriptions could better summarize the rationale for identified habitat feature priorities and linkages to projects (e.g., include specific headings for features and processes).

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____ Excellent⁵ **X** Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Prioritization of watershed and nearshore areas is among the best, whereas prioritization of actions could be substantially improved.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: _____Excellent⁶ **X Good** _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

As in the last round, there appears to be a good general outreach process but there is no prioritization or strategic approach to address the highest unmet biological priorities.

Issues are characterized in the summary but are not articulated clearly in the strategy, nor is a strategic approach to address them included in the strategy.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: _____Excellent⁷ **X Good** **X Fair** _____Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>The primary basis for strategy and identification of areas and projects appears to be limiting factors analysis.</i> <i>Other available information (e.g., watershed analysis) exists but it is not clear if or how it was utilized.</i> <i>Note: recent modeling work (EDT) is available that the lead entity expects be included in the next iteration of the strategy.</i>	
Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan	
7. Actions and geographic areas The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 	
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁸ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	
Narrative (rationale for rating): 	
8. Fit of project ranking The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests? 	
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁹ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>The list includes projects that appear appropriate given the level of prioritization described.</i> <i>Further strategic prioritization of actions and underlying rationale would be very helpful.</i>	

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is in the summer chum recovery plan, although with the exception of the associated nearshore area that plan hasn't fully resolved how the Skokomish will be addressed in the plan.

Similarly, the Puget Sound Chinook recovery plan includes a Mid-Hood Canal chapter that includes the strategy. The Chinook recovery plan does not now include Skokomish, although the strategy does address the Skokomish.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Island County**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan				
1. Actions and geographic areas The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 				
Rating: ___ Excellent ¹ <u>X</u> Good <u>X</u> Fair ___ Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Based on outcomes of past assessments (of which there are many), it is not clear that the level of community support is sufficient to lead to project development resulting from the assessments.</i> <i>Two of the five projects are not in highest priority areas (i.e., Deer Lagoon and West Whidbey).</i>				
2. Fit of project ranking The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 				
Rating: <u>X</u> Excellent² ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): 				

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is the habitat portion of the Island County chapter of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, which is the basis for the list.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **King County WRIA 8**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan	
1. <i>Actions and geographic areas</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 	
Rating: ___ Excellent ¹ <u>X</u> Good ___ Fair ___ Poor	
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Both projects are in tier 1 core areas, and the first project addresses the highest priority population, whereas the second project addresses the lowest (3rd) priority population.</i>	
2. <i>Fit of project ranking</i> The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 	
Rating: <u>X</u> Excellent² ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor	
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>The list is appropriately ranked given that there are only two projects on the list.</i>	

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is the Lake Washington chapter in the Puget Sound Chinook recovery plan, which is the basis for the list.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **King County WRIA 9**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan				
1. <i>Actions and geographic areas</i>				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent¹	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<p><i>The list of projects addresses high but broadly applied area priorities.</i></p> <p><i>The large number of high priority actions and the extent of high priority areas in the strategy detract somewhat from focus and make it difficult to ascertain how well the projects on the list are ordered compared to strategic needs.</i></p>				
2. <i>Fit of project ranking</i>				
The Review Panel will consider:				
Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 				
Rating:	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ²	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<p><i>The large number of high priority actions in the strategy detract from focus and make it difficult to ascertain how well the projects on the list are ordered compared to strategic needs.</i></p>				

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy forms the Green-Duwamish habitat restoration chapter in the Puget Sound Chinook recovery plan, which is the basis for the list.

Note: improved tools and approaches to address plan implementation over time (e.g., habitat work schedule) should improve focus on the strategic priorities.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Kitsap (East)**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan
<p>1. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: ____Excellent¹ X Good ____Fair ____Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>The list of projects only generally addresses highest priorities.</i></p> <p><i>Three projects do not directly address Chinook, which is the identified highest priority.</i></p> <p><i>Acquisition is not the highest priority for Chico Creek (but the #1 project on the list is an acquisition project). The Ollala project is in a tier 2 area and does not address Chinook.</i></p>
<p>2. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests?
<p>Rating: ____Excellent² X Good ____Fair ____Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Prioritizing all nearshore area as tier 1 is not specific, making it unclear how projects address the highest priority needs.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria that includes tier 1 and 2 appear to be similar, thus ranking is affected by scoring criteria to a greater extent than the strategy.</i></p>

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The project list was generated based on the strategy, prior to the completion of the habitat portion of the East Kitsap watershed chapter of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound (which now references the strategy as an appendix).

Note: The lead entity indicated they received comments from the Puget Sound TRT that will be utilized in revising the strategy in 2006.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Klickitat County**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
<p>1. <i>Species and stocks</i></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? Is the status of each stock presented? Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
<p>Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p>
<p>2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent³ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Progress in addressing processes was made but conditions and processes remain somewhat mixed.</i></p> <p><i>Processes rationale could be more fully developed and linkages to conditions could be more fully clarified.</i></p>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____ Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Reach level specificity of habitat conditions is good, but is too intermixed with information on processes.

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____ **X** Excellent⁵ _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Specificity is good where good information exists.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: X **Excellent**⁶ X **Good** **Fair** **Poor**

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy lays out community issue limitations and an approach to address them, based on an analysis by the lead entity.

Community issue identification and the strategy could be even further improved by reaching out to a broader community.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: **Excellent**⁷ **Good** X **Fair** **Poor**

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Available data and use is lacking. Many data gaps are identified. Need to include discussion of how data gaps affect conclusions reached in strategy matrix (e.g., p 5 of strategy).</i> <i>Need exists to take fullest advantage of all existing information and analyses and to apply or develop approaches and tools to analyze the potential response by fish toward strategic goals. This includes clarifying key hypotheses and assumptions associated with fish response to actions in the strategy.</i> <i>Community concerns with available modeling and analysis hampers confidence in results and interpretation.</i>	
Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan	
7. Actions and geographic areas The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 	
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁸ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):	
8. Fit of project ranking The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests? 	
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁹ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):	

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The lead entity strategy is not included in a regional salmon recovery plan.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan				
1. <i>Actions and geographic areas</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 				
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>The project list is extensive (21 projects).</i> <i>Over half of the projects on the list are in medium priority areas, and almost half are only in tier 2 reaches or lower.</i> <i>There appear to be a relatively large number of assessments and it is not clear how assessments are prioritized vs projects.</i> <i>One of the projects (Doty-Edwards) does not address primary populations.</i>				
2. <i>Fit of project ranking</i> The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 				
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ² <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>The area is large and diverse, with many listed species, and this makes it hard to discern how well the order fits the plan.</i>				

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is an appendix to the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Plan, which is the basis for the list.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Mason Conservation District**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹				
1. Species and stocks				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? Is the status of each stock presented? Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ²	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<p><i>Coho are highest priority; followed by listed Chinook, bull trout, and unlisted chum.</i></p> <p><i>The rationale for including healthy chum as high priority could be better articulated in the strategy, and species priorities in the strategy summary could be more clearly articulated.</i></p>				
2. Watershed and marine ecological processes				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities? 				
Rating:	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<p><i>Processes are weakly addressed, not clear or specific.</i></p> <p><i>The processes part of the strategy seems to be condition-based.</i></p>				

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Habitat features

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ☒ **Excellent**⁴ ☒ **Good** ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy could be more specific, and rationale could be clearer.

4. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ☐ Excellent⁵ ☒ **Good** ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Prioritization of specific areas is excellent, but prioritization of actions is more general.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: _____Excellent⁶ **X Good** _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy contains an outreach element that should lead to improved community support throughout the lead entity area, but the community strategy is not yet targeted to highest biological priorities.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: _____Excellent⁷ **X Good** **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy seems to be based on limiting factors analysis, and utilized some nearshore assessments and information.

There is a lack of quantitative data and analyses for freshwater.

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan			
7. Actions and geographic areas The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 			
Rating: <u> </u> Excellent ⁸ <u>X</u> Good <u> </u> Fair <u> </u> Poor			
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>All projects address needs in high priority areas and priority species in the strategy and Puget Sound Recovery Plan (given the general nature of nearshore priorities in that Plan). For example, the Wival Road project in a tributary of a tier 1 watershed is not specifically called for in the strategy.</i> <i>The Skookum Creek LWD project does not appear to be well aligned with the strategy.</i>			
8. Fit of project ranking The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests? 			
Rating: <u> </u> Excellent ⁹ <u>X</u> Good <u> </u> Fair <u> </u> Poor			
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>It was not fully clear how the strategy and recovery plan were used to develop and order projects.</i>			

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The basis for the list is both the strategy and the recovery plan. The strategy was used for freshwater projects and species priorities, and the nearshore chapter of the Puget Sound recovery plan is the basis for nearshore projects.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Nisqually**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan				
1. Actions and geographic areas				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
2. Fit of project ranking				
The Review Panel will consider:				
Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ²	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is the habitat portion of the Nisqually watershed chapter of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, which is the basis for the list.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
1. Species and stocks The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ___Excellent ² <u>X</u> Good ___Fair ___Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Priority species include: the four ESA-listed species, SaSI depressed stocks, a steelhead stock and healthy coho. This means that few species or stocks are not stock priorities, in turn limiting the utility of species/stocks as a criterion for prioritization.</i> <i>Species priorities do not have a direct effect on ranking criteria.</i>
2. Watershed and marine ecological processes The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ___Excellent ³ <u>X</u> Good ___Fair ___Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Processes well are identified but are not prioritized much, and a clear rationale for those that are identified is not provided.</i>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features are identified but not prioritized much, and a clear rationale for features that are identified is not provided.

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁵ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Watershed pages are a positive new addition to the strategy, but they do not appear to identify actions to the same level of specificity for all watersheds.

The extent of geographic area identified as being tier 1 priority is large. This continues to detract from focus.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: _____Excellent⁶ **X Good** _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Wide range of species, processes, and habitat priorities relate to a rather unfocused community issues strategy, although it is a good if general outreach strategy.

Development of a specific and targeted outreach approach to address nearshore armoring would be an improvement.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: _____Excellent⁷ **X Good** **X Fair** _____Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>The general nature of the prioritization scheme compounds the difficulty of achieving certainty.</i></p> <p><i>A fair amount of information exists from extensive watershed analyses across the breadth of the lead entity area.</i></p> <p><i>The strategy utilizes limiting factors analysis, but it does not appear that more quantitative analyses are available or fully utilized.</i></p>
<p>Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan</p>
<p>7. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁸ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>All projects do not address the highest action and area priorities stated in the strategy (e.g., not all are projects that are in tier 1). Further, all projects are in WRIA 19, a part of the area covered by the lead entity strategy and recovery plans in that area.</i></p>
<p>8. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁹ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

This strategy uses a multispecies approach that remains fairly unfocused and unspecific at the lead entity scale.

Scoring criteria appear to drive the order of the projects on the list, rather than the strategy (e.g., the rank of the top two projects). The rationale for how well the two are aligned and interact is not fully clear.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰**The Review Panel will consider:**

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

It is not fully clear how the list was developed using the strategy as specifically included in the two regional recovery plans. Four listed species overlap this lead entity. The strategy draws upon nearshore chapter of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, and the Hood Canal Coordinating Council plan for summer chum.

Note: Only one project in the list appears to be directly related to a recovery plan (i.e., in middle of the list the central Strait of Juan de Fuca assessment is a priority in the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound).

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Okanogan County**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
<p>1. Species and stocks</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? Is the status of each stock presented? Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Species or stocks are not explicitly prioritized in the strategy, and thus have no effect on ranking criteria.</i></p> <p><i>Watershed characterization makes note of where there are two or more listed species, which implicitly provides some prioritization at that scale.</i></p> <p><i>Clarifying the rationale for the approach would be helpful.</i></p>
<p>2. Watershed and marine ecological processes</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent³ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>The strategy summary and strategy do not articulate processes well. However, processes are reasonably well identified in the biological strategy, but could be better prioritized with supportive rationale.</i></p> <p><i>Processes and habitat conditions information are somewhat mixed.</i></p>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Habitat features

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Processes and habitat conditions are somewhat mixed.

It would be useful to better articulate the relationships between conditions and fish.

4. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: **X** Excellent⁵ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Areas are prioritized but the level of specificity varies.

It is not clear whether or not the biological strategy has been updated to reflect current priorities.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: _____Excellent⁶ _____Good **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The community issues section of the strategy is weak.

Some community issues are identified but the strategy does not address community issues that are obstacles to addressing highest priority biological priorities.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: _____Excellent⁷ **X Good** **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The biological strategy seems to be well founded, but it does not reflect available modeling (e.g., EDT, instream flow, water quality) or other quantitative analyses.

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan
<p>7. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: ___Excellent⁸ ___Good <u>X</u> Fair ___Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>It is not clear why there are no projects addressing category 1 watersheds, and highest action priorities.</i></p> <p><i>At least one project (Omak Ck) is in a category 3 watershed.</i></p> <p><i>Not all projects are the highest priorities in their watersheds.</i></p> <p><i>The strategy summary was not useful.</i></p>
<p>8. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests?
<p>Rating: ___Excellent⁹ <u>X</u> Good ___Fair ___Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>The rationale for the order of projects on the list is not fully clear (e.g., Methow Riparian protection project vs Beaver Creek project). In addition, the Methow Riparian project is in the strategy whereas the Beaver Creek project is not specifically in the strategy.</i></p>

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The project list was based on the strategy.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Pacific County**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
1. <i>Species and stocks</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Species and their status are identified but they are not prioritized, and thus there is nothing incorporated into ranking criteria.</i>
2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Processes are introduced but are not well developed or focused (and are discussed only very generally).</i>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Priorities are identified (watershed scale), but are not specific.

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁵ _____Good **X** Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Watersheds are not prioritized with specificity.

No specific action priorities with the exception of the Nemah and Naselle.

Rationales are not clear.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: Excellent⁶ Good X Fair Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Community issues are not well addressed in the strategy.

The strategy's principles could be better used to engage the community to develop a strategic approach to better identify and address community obstacles.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: Excellent⁷ Good X Fair Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Without clear and specific goals for the various species, it is difficult to know whether the strategy and projects are useful to advance those goals.

Harvest data is useful but doesn't clearly link to habitat.

Hypotheses and assumptions are not clearly articulated.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan**7. Actions and geographic areas**

The Review Panel will consider:

- Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas?
- Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?

Rating: _____Excellent⁸ _____Good **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The top few projects do not represent a strong project list.

Limited extent of most projects on the list is unlikely to significantly benefit multiple species (strategy has a multispecies emphasis).

8. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider:

Does the rank order of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:

- Stocks?
- Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Limiting habitat features?
- Actions?
- Geographic areas?
- Community interests?

Rating: _____Excellent⁹ _____Good **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The basis and rationale for the new ranking system is not clear.

Lack of strategy specificity hampers ability to rank projects.

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰
The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?• Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?• Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?•
Narrative only: <i>Not applicable. No regional recovery planning organization operates in this lead entity area.</i>

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Pend Oreille**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
1. <i>Species and stocks</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):
2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):
<i>Processes were not included in this strategy, as distinguished from habitat features.</i>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Factors are identified and prioritized by subbasin, with the rationale clearly based on limiting factors analysis (only).

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____X Excellent⁵ _____Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Note: The strategy includes a very clear prioritization of areas and actions organized by subbasin (i.e., map).

The specificity of actions could be improved in some subbasins, especially as processes are better delineated and prioritized.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ☒ **Excellent**⁶ ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Note: A community survey is being used to identify community issues associated with priorities in the strategy. This will provide a strong rationale for a resulting strategy to address community issues to achieve biological priorities.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: ☐ Excellent⁷ ☒ **Good** ☒ **Fair** ☐ Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>The strategy is very transparent about what the lead entity thinks they know and do not know.</i></p> <p><i>There is a general lack of quantitative data and analysis (may include modeling) underlying the strategy (e.g., watershed processes), and hypotheses and assumptions associated with potential fish response are not clearly articulated.</i></p>
<p>Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan</p>
<p>7. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁸ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>The last two projects are not in highest priority areas.</i></p>
<p>8. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests?
<p>Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁹ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Note: the lead entity used a very helpful summary matrix that clarifies the relationships of the project list to strategy priorities and scoring criteria. Other lead entities are encouraged to use tools like this in future grant rounds in communicating with the Panel.</i></p>

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

Not applicable. No regional recovery planning organization operates in this lead entity area.

The strategy and project list are aimed at the priorities in the USFWS bull trout.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Pierce County**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
1. Species and stocks The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ___Excellent ² <u>X</u> Good ___Fair ___Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Chinook are highest priority in WRIA 10 and coho are highest priority in WRIA 12.</i> <i>Ranking criteria do not appear to reflect species priorities.</i>
2. Watershed and marine ecological processes The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ___Excellent ³ ___Good <u>X</u> Fair ___Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Processes are described superficially, and the strategy does not lay out the logic path and connection to fish well.</i>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Habitat features

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The rationale and underlying application of information from EDT could be clearer and more specific.

The connection between features and ranking criteria could be improved.

4. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁵ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Delineation of actions could be more specific (e.g., rationale for interim and longer-term priorities are not fully clear), and prioritization is lacking.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ___Excellent⁶ **X Good** ___Fair ___Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Community issue needs are generally identified, but relationships to projects are not.

An example of an issue was the lack of sponsorship capacity to deal with large scale projects in the mainstem, but no strategic actions were identified to deal with the issue.

A proactive approach to build support for projects could benefit from an analysis of community issues.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: ___Excellent⁷ **X Good** **X Fair** ___Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Narrative (rationale for rating):	
<i>The strategy cited multiple analyses (e.g., EDT, SHIRAZ), limiting factors and VSP analysis, but more should be done to more clearly characterize the underlying empirical information and assumptions associated with the models identified.</i>	
Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan	
7. Actions and geographic areas	
<p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 	
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁸ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):	
8. Fit of project ranking	
<p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 	
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁹ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):	

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy submitted by the lead entity is a part of a chapter in the Puget Sound recovery plan for listed Chinook and bull trout.

The list includes projects for both Chinook and non-listed coho.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Quinault Nation**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹				
1. <i>Species and stocks</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities? 				
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): 				
2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities? 				
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Progress from last year is reflected in the general list of processes, but no rationale or sources of information are provided.</i>				

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Habitat features

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____ Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features are identified but only coarsely, without much prioritization (e.g., identifies the same priorities for all watersheds), and the rationale needs to be better articulated.

4. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____ Excellent⁵ _____ Good **X** Fair _____ Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Identified actions and areas in the actions and geographic areas table are not very specific.

Some prioritization is provided in the strategy summary that is not in the strategy.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: Excellent⁶ Good X Fair Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Progress from last year is reflected in an outreach process, but more is needed to develop a strategic approach to address the highest priority biological needs and areas.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: Excellent⁷ Good Fair X Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>The stated underpinning for the strategy is limiting factors analysis, but the strategy does not clearly or fully utilize that information or other information that is available.</i></p> <p><i>The strategy and prioritization did not appear to be well supported by clearly laid out hypotheses and assumptions associated with fish response to actions identified in the strategy, and it is not clear how much of the information used has an empirical basis.</i></p>
<p>Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan</p>
<p>7. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁸ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Although the projects are in priority areas it is not clear how well the entire list effectively benefits salmon in the most strategic fashion (due to the lack of specificity for watershed processes and actions).</i></p>
<p>8. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁹ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The subjective ranking process is unclear.

Lack of strategy specificity hampers achieving a higher rating.

Wide range of issues addressed on the list appears to reflect the lack of prioritization on habitat processes and actions.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?
-

Narrative only:

Not applicable. No regional recovery planning organization operates in this lead entity area.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **San Juan County**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan
<p>1. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: ___Excellent¹ <u>X</u> Good ___Fair ___Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>General actions and near-term actions are identified but are not prioritized in the strategy.</i></p> <p><i>Every project on the list is called for in the unprioritized strategy.</i></p> <p><i>Note: the genetics project is not specifically identified in the strategy (but the general need for information on habitat use by juvenile salmon is).</i></p>
<p>2. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests?
<p>Rating: ___Excellent² <u>X</u> Good <u>X</u> Fair ___Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>In the opinion of the Panel, the top two projects are good topics for studies that relate to strategy priorities.</i></p> <p><i>The rationale for the order of the projects on the list is not clear and supportable.</i></p>

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy forms the habitat portion of the San Juan chapter and relates to the nearshore chapter of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound, which is the basis for the list.

It is a protection-oriented (regulatory) strategy at this time and generally defers restoration efforts to a subsequent phase, in favor of assessments.

The project list reflects the general priorities in the recovery plan for this area (i.e., protection, research).

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Skagit Watershed Council**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹				
1. Species and stocks The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities? 				
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
2. Watershed and marine ecological processes The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities? 				
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<i>Watershed processes are identified for upper areas but not across the full breadth of the lead entity area, and processes are not prioritized in other than the target areas.</i> <i>The strategy could be improved by prioritizing upstream watershed processes and addressing their linkages to habitat conditions, and how upstream processes linkages to their effects on the estuary.</i>				

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Habitat features

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The annual strategic approach very generally identifies habitat features without stratifying within target areas.

The working strategic document (application of the SWC strategy) could better synthesize and articulate available information in for use by project sponsors. (note: this comment also applies to watershed processes.)

4. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁵ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Areas are generally identified and prioritized into tiers, and they outline objectives for restoration, but do not clearly relate to a list of prioritized actions.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ___Excellent⁶ **X Good** ___Fair ___Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Outreach issues are touched on only lightly in the strategy and summary, but there is a companion outreach strategy document that includes a good general analysis of community issues and a strategy to address them.

The strategy could be more focused, specific, and prioritized to ensure that outreach actions are directed toward building support for the highest priority actions.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: ___Excellent⁷ **X Good** ___Fair ___Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Relatively data rich, and various analyses are available and used.</i></p> <p><i>Further analysis and modeling of expected benefits or outcomes of strategy implementation would be very helpful.</i></p>
<p>Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan</p>
<p>7. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁸ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Only two projects are in Tier 1 areas although eight of them address Tier 1 species.</i></p> <p><i>The difficulty of recruiting more Tier 1 projects was clear.</i></p>
<p>8. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent⁹ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Between the summary materials and presentation received, it is unclear how the ranking process lead to the final ranked list. (E.g., why Fisher Slough ranked in the middle of the list.)</i></p>

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is not now formally part of the Puget Sound Chinook recovery plan. However, the strategy appears to be consistent with the habitat component of the watershed recovery plan developed by the co-managers.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Snake River Salmon Recovery Board**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan
<p>1. Actions and geographic areas</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent¹ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Eleven of the 12 projects (with the exception of #12-Dry Ck, which is in an mSA), are in highest priority areas.</i></p>
<p>2. Fit of project ranking</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests?
<p>Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Note: Map and table materials that were used in the presentation to the Panel that summarized the plan and relationship of the projects to priorities were very helpful and would have been a great addition to the written strategy summary.</i></p>

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is part of the Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan, which is the basis for the list.

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Snohomish**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan	
<p>1. <i>Actions and geographic areas</i></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 	
<p>Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Rated excellent; however, the prioritization scheme (e.g., using subbasin groups, project categories, and example projects) is highly complicated, making it difficult to follow how the projects are aligned through the layers. It would be helpful if the strategy summary included descriptions of how each project responds to or fits the prioritization scheme.</i></p>	
<p>2. <i>Fit of project ranking</i></p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <p>Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 	
<p>Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>	
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>(Same comment as for fit to actions and areas.)</i></p>	

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is the habitat portion of the Snohomish watershed chapter of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound.

Project list and rank order of the list address priorities in the recovery plan.

Note: development of strategic approaches to project implementation and scheduling would be useful (e.g., habitat work schedule).

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan				
1. Actions and geographic areas				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
2. Fit of project ranking				
The Review Panel will consider:				
Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ²	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<i>Rated excellent, but the strategy summary could better articulate relationships between priorities and projects.</i>				

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is the habitat portion of the Stillaguamish watershed chapter of the Shared Strategy for Puget Sound.

The project list and rank order of the list address priorities in the recovery plan.

Note: The 10-yr implementation plan is a significant step, but it would help to clarify how the projects on the list accomplish that 10-year implementation plan (e.g., via more specificity, habitat work schedule).

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Thurston County**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹
<p>1. Species and stocks</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? Is the status of each stock presented? Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
<p>Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Coho are the highest priority, followed by listed Chinook, bull trout, and unlisted chum.</i></p> <p><i>The rationale for including healthy chum as high priority could be better articulated in the strategy, and species priorities in the strategy summary could be more clearly articulated.</i></p>
<p>2. Watershed and marine ecological processes</p> <p>The Review Panel will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
<p>Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent³ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>
<p>Narrative (rationale for rating):</p> <p><i>Processes are weakly addressed, and are not clear or specific.</i></p> <p><i>Processes information seems to be condition-based.</i></p>

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The information on habitat features in the strategy could be more specific, and rationale could be clearer.

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: X Excellent⁵ X Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Prioritization of specific areas is excellent, but prioritization of actions is more general.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: _____Excellent⁶ **X Good** _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Strategy contains an outreach element that should lead to improved community support throughout the lead entity area, but is not yet targeted to the highest biological priorities.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: _____Excellent⁷ **X Good** **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy seems to be based on limiting factors analysis, and utilized some nearshore assessments and information.

There is a lack of quantitative data and analyses for freshwater.

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan			
7. Actions and geographic areas The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 			
Rating: ____Excellent ⁸ ____Good <u>X</u> Fair ____Poor			
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>The lone project does not align well with the highest priority areas or with the benefits and certainty elements of the strategy.</i> <i>The project is not in the highest priority area, but it is the highest priority action for Ellis Creek.</i>			
8. Fit of project ranking The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests? 			
Rating: ____Excellent ⁹ ____Good ____Fair ____Poor			
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Not applicable (only one project on the list).</i>			

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is the basis for the project.

The project is not prioritized as part of the Puget Sound recovery plan.

¹⁰ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **WRIA 1 (Nooksack)**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan	
1. <i>Actions and geographic areas</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? • Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 	
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ¹ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Not all projects are in the highest priority areas identified in the strategy.</i>	
2. <i>Fit of project ranking</i> The Review Panel will consider: Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities in the strategy for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stocks? • Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Limiting habitat features? • Actions? • Geographic areas? • Community interests? 	
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	
Narrative (rationale for rating):	

¹ The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

² The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed and marine ecological processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists³

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy is the WRIA 1 – Nooksack chapter in the Puget Sound Chinook recovery plan.

Note: It is not clear how the priorities in the submitted strategy align with those in the recovery plan, because information was presented in the plan that is not fully consistent with those presented in strategy materials (i.e., Canyon Ck project).

³ Not rated.

SRFB 2005 (6th) Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin**

Specificity, Focus, and Certainty of Strategy¹				
1. <i>Species and stocks</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities? 				
Rating: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent² <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): 				
2. <i>Watershed and marine ecological processes</i> The Review Panel will consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the strategy clearly identify the watershed and marine ecological processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities? 				
Rating: <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent ³ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor				
Narrative (rationale for rating): <i>Processes at the watershed-wide scale are generally identified, but more synthesis is needed to be more locally specific and prioritized.</i>				

¹ See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, June 2005 update, for details.

² The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

³ The strategy clearly identifies limiting watershed processes and prioritizes these watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. *Habitat features*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁴ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Features are identified but not clearly prioritized.

4. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed and marine ecological processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent⁵ **X** Good _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good job of identifying and prioritizing areas (MSAs), but prioritization and identification of actions at finer scales would be helpful.

⁴ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and prioritizes these habitat features for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

⁵ In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

5. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:

- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for the highest biological priority salmon protection and restoration efforts?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Does the strategy identify what types of biological based high priority projects, areas, and actions do not currently enjoy community support necessary for successful implementation, and why?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Are project ranking criteria identified that reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy identify an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: _____Excellent⁶ **X** **Good** _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Lots of improvement has been made in this aspect of strategy.

More could be done to identify highest priority actions that specifically and strategically build community support and address highest biological priority actions and areas.

6. Certainty

The Review Panel will consider:

- How well supported are hypotheses/assumptions for (1) attributes (e.g., abundance, productivity distribution, diversity), and (2) watershed processes and habitat conditions, that are most limiting fish response? What is the nature of the data to support these hypotheses? [Watershed Data Quality]
- How well have the habitat actions been shown to work? [Empirical Support]

Rating: _____Excellent⁷ **X** **Good** _____Fair _____Poor

⁶ In an excellent strategy: The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

⁷ In an excellent strategy rating: The strategy addresses with empirical data all key assumptions related to factors most limiting watershed processes and habitat conditions affecting fish response, and clearly demonstrates that actions identified in the strategy will achieve the stated goals and objectives for the prioritized species/stock(s).

Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<i>Appears to be relatively data rich, and the supportive use of EDT modeling is an asset.</i>				
<i>Further analysis of expected benefits or outcomes of strategy implementation would be very helpful.</i>				
Fit of the Project List to the Strategy or Recovery Plan				
7. Actions and geographic areas				
The Review Panel will consider:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on scientific information and assessment of community interests, does the project list address the highest priority action and areas? Does the project list benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed and marine ecological processes, and limiting habitat features? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁸	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):				
<i>The actions on the list appear to address the types of actions and limiting factors identified in the strategy; however, the strategy does not provide a list of specific, prioritized actions.</i>				
<i>The presentation did not clearly articulate the relationships of EDT results and how they were reflected in maps.</i>				
<i>Some adjustments were made to the priority areas used for EDT modeling, so the list does not align as clearly with the EDT results as it could.</i>				
<i>Without clear priorities and without more explanation, it is hard to be certain that the list fits the strategy.</i>				
8. Fit of project ranking				
The Review Panel will consider:				
Does the rank <u>order</u> of the project list address the highest priorities identified in the strategy for:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocks? Limiting watershed and marine ecological processes? Limiting habitat features? Actions? Geographic areas? Community interests? 				
Rating:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent ⁹	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor

⁸ To achieve an excellent rating: The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

⁹ To achieve an excellent rating: The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the specific and focused priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy or recovery plan. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest specific and focused priorities identified in the strategy or plan and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy or plan, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good job of internal review and adjustments to meet needs identified in the strategy.

The scoring process does not yet account for the magnitude of benefits to salmon in a quantitative fashion, although that is planned and the approach does now take advantage of best professional judgment.

Relationship Between Strategies, Recovery Plans, and Project Lists¹⁰

The Review Panel will consider:

- Is the strategy included in a regional salmon recovery plan prepared by a regional organization?
- Does the project list reflect the local and regional priorities in the recovery plan?
- Does the rank order of projects on the list consistently and clearly reflect the priorities in the recovery plan?

Narrative only:

The strategy was used in development of the Yakima Basin Fish Recovery Plan (for listed steelhead and bull trout), and the projects on the list appear to reflect the priorities in that Plan.

Yakima Subbasin plan, lead entity strategy and Yakima Basin Recovery Plan together form the basis of the project list.

¹⁰ Not rated.